

## Chapter 1 : Randolph Bourne, War is the Health of the State ()

*This, too, is the meaning of 'War is the Health of the State': war is the death of individualism. Conclusion Bourne's essays written in opposition to World War I while he was on the editorial staff of the New Republic are not typical of anti-war literature.*

It is just seven months since a commission chaired by former senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman said "a direct attack against American citizens on American soil is likely over the next quarter century. And about competitive worship of a bookkeeping fiction the Social Security trust fund. That may be particularly disorienting to Democrats, who have prospered when stressing domestic issues. Now many matters acquire a national-security aspect. Are several Democratic senators still eager to filibuster against the House-passed plan for limited energy exploration in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge? Democrats probably must shelve any plans they had to mobilize their base in by waving the bloody shirt of Florida--Bush the illegitimate president. And there probably will be diminished political mileage in portraying the president as a syntactically challenged bumpkin. Republicans may now be largely immunized against blame for whatever economic difficulties the country experiences in the next year. However, they are most comfortable when talking about restraining the growth of government, and they are about to relearn the truth of the axiom that war is the health of the state. From missile defense to new offensive and intelligence capabilities, the Bush administration wants more, and more muscular, government. In addition, this crisis will require Republicans to make ideological adjustments about the proper scope as well as the scale of government. The coming infusion of public money into the air-transportation system will not be the only way in which a Republican administration is going to preside over a further blurring of the line between the public and private sectors. To take just one example, the Los Angeles Times reports that the largest intelligence agency, the National Security Agency, had its budget, which is enveloped in secrecy, substantially cut in the s. This has had a crippling effect on an agency that reportedly every day captures more data than is contained in the Library of Congress. Was there information that might have warned of the September 11 attacks--information that went unsifted and untranslated? Poll takers report a sharp drop in what they call the "refusal rate"--the number of persons who decline to answer polling questions. Will the trauma of terrorism tend to freeze the competitive balance between the parties? But on domestic issues the country had been swinging strongly toward the Republicans since Roosevelt won in , with Europe in flames, primarily because of his foreign-policy experience. And with the large exception of the Battle of Midway, was a year of discouraging news. Given the nature of the twilight war Bush has announced, could be a discouraging year, or at least one intensely frustrating to this famously impatient nation. A huge imponderable is how, and for how long, this trauma, and what promises to be a long, often shadowy war against what Rudman calls "spongy" targets, will affect American realism. Last century America fought a "war to end all wars. There will be time enough to reflect on the deeper meanings of September 11, including the resilience, indeed the permanence, of evil. Rieux, "remembered that such joy is always imperiled. He knew what those jubilant crowds did not know Which is why for America, there are only two kinds of years, the war years and the interwar years.

## Chapter 2 : War Is the Health of the State

*John Dos Passos, an influential American modernist writer, eulogized Bourne in the chapter "Randolph Bourne" of his novel and drew heavily on the ideas presented in War Is The Health of the State in the novel.*

The evolution of these efforts and the reasons for their failure make for an intriguing lesson in American history, ideology, and character. Other developed countries have had some form of social insurance that later evolved into national insurance for nearly as long as the US has been trying to get it. Some European countries started with compulsory sickness insurance, one of the first systems, for workers beginning in Germany in 1883; other countries including Austria, Hungary, Norway, Britain, Russia, and the Netherlands followed all the way through. Other European countries, including Sweden in 1891, Denmark in 1892, France in 1898, and Switzerland in 1900, subsidized the mutual benefit societies that workers formed among themselves. So for a very long time, other countries have had some form of universal health care or at least the beginnings of it. The primary reason for the emergence of these programs in Europe was income stabilization and protection against the wage loss of sickness rather than payment for medical expenses, which came later. Programs were not universal to start with and were originally conceived as a means of maintaining incomes and buying political allegiance of the workers. In a seeming paradox, the British and German systems were developed by the more conservative governments in power, specifically as a defense to counter expansion of the socialist and labor parties. US circa 1890, including Reformers and the Progressive Era: The government took no actions to subsidize voluntary funds or make sick insurance compulsory; essentially the federal government left matters to the states and states left them to private and voluntary programs. The US did have some voluntary funds that provided for their members in the case of sickness or death, but there were no legislative or public programs during the late 19th or early 20th century. In the Progressive Era, which occurred in the early 20th century, reformers were working to improve social conditions for the working class. Therefore the first proposals for health insurance in the US did not come into political debate under anti-socialist sponsorship as they had in Europe. Theodore Roosevelt

During the Progressive Era, President Theodore Roosevelt was in power and although he supported health insurance because he believed that no country could be strong whose people were sick and poor, most of the initiative for reform took place outside of government. They were a typical progressive group whose mandate was not to abolish capitalism but rather to reform it. In 1909, they created a committee on social welfare which held its first national conference in 1911. Despite its broad mandate, the committee decided to concentrate on health insurance, drafting a model bill in 1912. The services of physicians, nurses, and hospitals were included, as was sick pay, maternity benefits, and a death benefit of fifty dollars to pay for funeral expenses. This death benefit becomes significant later on. Costs were to be shared between workers, employers, and the state. They found prominent physicians who were not only sympathetic, but who also wanted to support and actively help in securing legislation. Times have definitely changed along the way. There was disagreement on the method of paying physicians and it was not long before the AMA leadership denied it had ever favored the measure. They apparently worried that a government-based insurance system would weaken unions by usurping their role in providing social benefits. Their central concern was maintaining union strength, which was understandable in a period before collective bargaining was legally sanctioned. But because the reformer health insurance plans also covered funeral expenses, there was a big conflict. Reformers felt that by covering death benefits, they could finance much of the health insurance costs from the money wasted by commercial insurance policies who had to have an army of insurance agents to market and collect on these policies. But since this would have pulled the rug out from under the multi-million dollar commercial life insurance industry, they opposed the national health insurance proposal. Other efforts during this time in California, namely the California Social Insurance Commission, recommended health insurance, proposed enabling legislation in 1913, and then held a referendum. New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Illinois also had some efforts aimed at health insurance. But in the Red Scare, immediately after the war, when the government attempted to root out the last vestiges of radicalism, opponents of compulsory health insurance associated it with Bolshevism and buried it in an avalanche of anti-Communist rhetoric. Why did the

Progressives fail? Opposition from doctors, labor, insurance companies, and business contributed to the failure of Progressives to achieve compulsory national health insurance. In addition, the inclusion of the funeral benefit was a tactical error since it threatened the gigantic structure of the commercial life insurance industry. Political naivete on the part of the reformers in failing to deal with the interest group opposition, ideology, historical experience, and the overall political context all played a key role in shaping how these groups identified and expressed their interests. By now, medical costs for workers were regarded as a more serious problem than wage loss from sickness. Medical, and especially hospital, care was now a bigger item in family budgets than wage losses. Concerns over the cost and distribution of medical care led to the formation of this self-created, privately funded group. The committee was funded by 8 philanthropic organizations including the Rockefeller, Millbank, and Rosenwald foundations. They first met in and ceased meeting in . The CCMC was comprised of fifty economists, physicians, public health specialists, and major interest groups. Their research determined that there was a need for more medical care for everyone, and they published these findings in 26 research volumes and 15 smaller reports over a 5-year period. The CCMC recommended that more national resources go to medical care and saw voluntary, not compulsory, health insurance as a means to covering these costs. Most CCMC members opposed compulsory health insurance, but there was no consensus on this point within the committee. We might have thought the Great Depression would create the perfect conditions for passing compulsory health insurance in the US, but with millions out of work, unemployment insurance took priority followed by old age benefits. It was therefore excluded. The Wagner National Health Act of . However, the election brought a conservative resurgence and any further innovations in social policy were extremely difficult. Most of the social policy legislation precedes . He passionately believed in a national health program and compulsory health insurance. Many of them, including Milton Romer and Milton Terris, were instrumental in forming the medical care section of the American Public Health Association, which then served as a national meeting ground for those committed to health care reform. First introduced in , it became the very famous Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill. The bill called for compulsory national health insurance and a payroll tax. Opposition to this bill was enormous and the antagonists launched a scathing red baiting attack on the committee saying that one of its key policy analysts, I. Although the Wagner-Murray-Dingell Bill generated extensive national debates, with the intensified opposition, the bill never passed by Congress despite its reintroduction every session for 14 years! Had it passed, the Act would have established compulsory national health insurance funded by payroll taxes. The health care issue finally moved into the center arena of national politics and received the unreserved support of an American president. Though he served during some of the most virulent anti-Communist attacks and the early years of the Cold War, Truman fully supported national health insurance. But the opposition had acquired new strength. The chairman of the House Committee was an anti-union conservative and refused to hold hearings. It is to my mind the most socialistic measure this Congress has ever had before it. The AMA claimed it would make doctors slaves, even though Truman emphasized that doctors would be able to choose their method of payment. In , the Republicans took control of Congress and had no interest in enacting national health insurance. They charged that it was part of a large socialist scheme. Truman responded by focusing even more attention on a national health bill in the election. He declared socialized medicine is the keystone to the arch of the socialist state. Compromises were proposed but none were successful. Instead of a single health insurance system for the entire population, America would have a system of private insurance for those who could afford it and public welfare services for the poor. Discouraged by yet another defeat, the advocates of health insurance now turned toward a more modest proposal they hoped the country would adopt: Union-negotiated health care benefits also served to cushion workers from the impact of health care costs and undermined the movement for a government program. Why did these efforts for universal national health insurance fail again? For many of the same reasons they failed before: For the next several years, not much happened in terms of national health insurance initiatives. The nation focussed more on unions as a vehicle for health insurance, the Hill-Burton Act of related to hospital expansion, medical research and vaccines, the creation of national institutes of health, and advances in psychiatry. Predictably, the AMA undertook a massive campaign to portray a government insurance plan as a threat to the patient-doctor relationship. But by concentrating on the aged, the terms of the

debate began to change for the first time. There was major grass roots support from seniors and the pressures assumed the proportions of a crusade. In the entire history of the national health insurance campaign, this was the first time that a ground swell of grass roots support forced an issue onto the national agenda. In response, the government expanded its proposed legislation to cover physician services, and what came of it were Medicare and Medicaid. Finally, in , Johnson signed it into law as part of his Great Society Legislation, capping 20 years of congressional debate. What does history teach us? What is the movement reacting to? The institutional representatives of society do not always represent those that they claim to represent, just as the AMA does not represent all doctors. This lack of representation presents an opportunity for attracting more people to the cause. There have been periods of acquiescence in this debate before. Those who oppose it can not kill this movement. Openings will occur again. We all need to be on the lookout for those openings and also need to create openings where we see opportunities. Vincente Navarro says that the majority opinion of national health insurance has everything to do with repression and coercion by the capitalist corporate dominant class. He argues that the conflict and struggles that continuously take place around the issue of health care unfold within the parameters of class and that coercion and repression are forces that determine policy. I think when we talk about interest groups in this country, it is really a code for class. Red-baiting is a red herring and has been used throughout history to evoke fear and may continue to be used in these post Cold War times by those who wish to inflame this debate. Grass roots initiatives contributed in part to the passage of Medicare, and they can work again. Such legislation does not emerge quietly or with broad partisan support. It took another decade for the rest of the country to catch on. That is about 50 years all together. We fought, we threatened, the doctors went on strike, refused patients, people held rallies and signed petitions for and against it, burned effigies of government leaders, hissed, jeered, and booed at the doctors or the Premier depending on whose side they were on. Although there was plenty of resistance, now you could more easily take away Christmas than health care, despite the rhetoric that you may hear to the contrary. Finally there is always hope for flexibility and change.

Chapter 3 : War, Peace, and the State | Mises Institute

*"War is the health of the State." The famous seven words appeared in an unfinished manuscript written by the progressive essayist Randolph Silliman Bourne () during World War I.*

America has been at war for over a decade now and hostilities are not abating. American troops and clout have spread across the Arab world and the Middle East, leaving casualties heaped and enemies gathering. If economic emergencies usher in conflict, then more war is coming. The State, Government, and Society In times of peace, Bourne believed the majority of people pursued their own interests according to their own values. They worked and cooperated with each other, married and raised children without paying much attention to the state. Instead, they dealt with the government. Bourne defined government as a framework of the administration of laws, and the carrying out of the public force. Government is the idea of the State put into practical operation in the hands of definite, concrete, fallible men. Government was the practical day-to-day "offices and functions" of a state such as the post office or the public school system, with which people came into contact as they simply pursued life. There was no ritual and no singing of national anthems as postage stamps were purchased. The civil servants whose jobs make government function had no sense of sanctity about them. Indeed, Bourne described them as "common and unsanctified men. Meanwhile, the average person rarely dealt with the state" that is, with institutions that were sanctified and expressed the "enduring" state, such as the Supreme Court. Thus in times of peace, Bourne wrote, "the sense of the State almost fades out of the consciousness of men. In the United States, it is the political structure established after the American Revolution that is embodied in the Constitution and Bill of Rights. It claims a chain of legitimacy that dates back to President George Washington. While governments come and go with elections, the state remains essentially the same" only growing stronger with time. It is the state rather than government that inspires emotions such as awe or patriotism. It is to the concept of the American state" not to any particular government, Republican or Democratic" to which people pledge allegiance with hands placed over their hearts. Meanwhile, "society" functions differently from the state, government, or the self-interested individual. Society, which Bourne refers to as "nation" or "country," is the collection of factors that constitute American life. They include characteristic attitudes, common lore and literature, religious convictions, a shared history, and the prevailing cultural norms. They are the nonpolitical factors that make American society different from Chinese or French societies. In times of peace, Bourne believed most people identified more closely with society than they did with government. For example, most people defined themselves most closely in relationship to a community, religion, or ethnic heritage rather than to a political party. Unlike government, society is not an expression of the state, nor can it peacefully coexist with the state; the two concepts are antagonistic. In an essay entitled *The State* in which the first section is entitled "War is the health of the State," Bourne observes, Country [society] is a concept of peace, tolerance, of living and letting live. But State is essentially a concept of power, of competition; it signifies a group in its aggressive aspects. And we have the misfortune of being born not only into a country but into a State, and as we grow up we learn to mingle the two feelings into a hopeless confusion. The Impact of War Bourne defined war as the ultimate act of statehood, as the utmost act of "a group in its aggressive aspects. Bourne argued further that war blurs or erases the lines that separate government from the state and both of them from society. The blurring happens largely within the individual himself. Stoked by emotion, the average person fills with patriotism and loses "all sense of the distinction between State, nation and government. Patriotism becomes the dominant feeling, and produces immediately that intense and hopeless confusion between the relations which the individual bears and should bear towards the society of which he is a part. In times of war, the government and state become virtually identical, so that to oppose the government becomes an act of disloyalty to the state. For example, although criticizing the president or military attitudes is a right regularly exercised by Americans in peace time, such criticism becomes an act of treason when war has just been declared. As Bourne explained, objections to the war, luke-warm opinions concerning the necessity or the beauty of conscription, are made subject to ferocious penalties, far exceeding in severity those affixed to

actual pragmatic crimes. Thus, in wartime, individuals who only casually interacted with the government now become fervid defenders of the state. Every individual citizen who in peace times had no function to perform by which he could imagine himself an expression or living fragment of the State becomes an active amateur agent in reporting spies and disloyalists, in raising Government funds, or in propagating such measures as are considered necessary by officialdom. The activities of society from the words spoken at pulpits to those written in newspapers, from economic exchanges to entertainment begin to conform with the purposes of the state rather than the self-interest of individuals. As society and government merge into the state, the individual begins to disappear. The individual becomes part of what Bourne called "the herd. Nevertheless, "by an ingenious mixture of cajolery, agitation, intimidation, the herd is licked into shape, into an effective mechanical unity, if not into a spiritual whole. Individuals usually agreed, reluctantly or not, because in "a nation at war, every citizen identifies himself with the whole, and feels immensely strengthened in that identification. And, so, individuals obey wartime measures even to the point of risking their lives on battlefields. People cease to be individuals acting in self-interest and become citizens of the state acting in concert. The man who dissents and remains an individual feels "forlorn and helpless," while those who think and feel collectively have "the warm feeling of obedience, the soothing irresponsibility of protection. This is the theoretical meaning of "War is the health of the State. In times of war, everything reverses to the benefit of the state. As for the impact on the individual, if war is the health of the state, then war is also the death of individualism. He does not rail against the profits reaped by the military-industrial complex, which were then collectively known as "the munitions makers. Bourne eloquently argued that postwar America would be morally, intellectually, and psychologically impoverished. By this observation, Bourne did not mean that peacetime America would struggle under an increased bureaucracy that never seems to roll back to prewar levels. Many historians have made this point. Again, he was addressing less tangible, though arguably more lasting, costs of war. For example, post America would be burdened by intellectuals who had "forgotten that the real enemy is War rather than imperial Germany. But, then, the impact of war on intellectuals is the theme for a future article and it was addressed by Bourne in his second most acclaimed essay "The War and the Intellectuals.

Chapter 4 : The State (). By Randolph Bourne // Fair Use Repository

*War is the health of the State. It automatically sets in motion throughout society those irresistible forces for uniformity, for passionate co-operation with the Government in coercing into obedience the minority groups and individuals which lack the larger herd sense.*

The Clinton health care plan included mandatory enrollment in a health insurance plan, subsidies to guarantee affordability across all income ranges, and the establishment of health alliances in each state. Every citizen or permanent resident would thus be guaranteed medical care. The bill faced withering criticism by Republicans, led by William Kristol, who communicated his concern that a Democratic health care bill would "revive the reputation of Democrats as the generous protector of middle-class interests. And it will at the same time strike a punishing blow against Republican claims to defend the middle class by restraining government. During each stop, the bus riders would talk about their personal experiences, health care disasters and why they felt it was important for all Americans to have health insurance. It was undertaken in an effort to ensure the quality of care of all patients by preserving the integrity of the processes that occur in the health care industry. In fact, many interest groups, including the American Medical Association AMA and the pharmaceutical industry came out vehemently against the congressional bill. Basically, providing emergency medical care to anyone, regardless of health insurance status, as well as the right of a patient to hold their health plan accountable for any and all harm done proved to be the biggest stumbling blocks for this bill. As president, Bush signed into law the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act which included a prescription drug plan for elderly and disabled Americans. While the estimates varied, they all indicated that the increase in coverage and the funding requirements of the Bush plan would both be lower than those of the more comprehensive Kerry plan. John Conyers, Jr. As of October, HR has 93 co-sponsors. As of October, S. The resulting tax revenues should be used to subsidize the purchase of insurance by individuals. These subsidies, "which could take many forms, such as direct subsidies or refundable tax credits, would improve the current situation in at least two ways: Berkeley School of Law Center on Health, that in essence said that the government should offer a public health insurance plan to compete on a level playing field with private insurance plans. The argument is based on three basic points. Firstly, public plans success at managing cost control Medicare medical spending rose 4. Secondly, public insurance has better payment and quality-improvement methods because of its large databases, new payment approaches, and care-coordination strategies. Thirdly, it can set a standard against which private plans must compete, which would help unite the public around the principle of broadly shared risk while building greater confidence in government in the long term. Among the proposals was the establishment of an independent comparative effectiveness entity that compares and evaluates the benefits, risks, and incremental costs of new drugs, devices, and biologics. Health care reform in the United States presidential election, Although both candidates had a health care system that revolved around private insurance markets with help from public insurance programs, both had different opinions on how this system should operate when put in place. The senator proposed to replace special tax breaks for persons with employer-based health care coverage with a universal system of tax credits. In his plan, Senator McCain proposed the Guaranteed Access Plan which would provide federal assistance to the states to secure health insurance coverage through high-risk areas. His health care plan called for the creation of a National Health Insurance Exchange that would include both private insurance plans and a Medicare-like government run option. Coverage would be guaranteed regardless of health status, and premiums would not vary based on health status either. It would have required parents to cover their children, but did not require adults to buy insurance. The Philadelphia Inquirer reported that the two plans had different philosophical focuses. They described the purpose of the McCain plan as to "make insurance more affordable," while the purpose of the Obama plan was for "more people to have health insurance. Affordability was the primary health care priority among both sets of voters. Obama voters were more likely than McCain voters to believe government can do much about health care costs. An individual insurance mandate with a financial penalty as a quid pro quo for guaranteed issue Updates to the Medicare physician fee schedule; Setting standards and

expectations for safety and quality of diagnostics; Promoting care coordination and patient-centered care by designating a " medical home " that would replace fragmented care with a coordinated approach to care. Physicians would receive a periodic payment for a set of defined services, such as care coordination that integrates all treatment received by a patient throughout an illness or an acute event. Bundled payments instead of individual billing for the management of chronic conditions in which providers would have shared accountability and responsibility for the management of chronic conditions such as coronary artery disease, diabetes, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and asthma, and similarly A fixed rate all-inclusive average payment for acute care episodes which tend to follow a pattern even though some acute care episodes may cost more or less than this. On the panel of the "invited stakeholder", no supporter of the Single-payer health care system was invited. A merged single bill is the likely outcome. Republicans have also expressed opposition to the use of comparative effectiveness research to limit coverage in any public sector plan including any public insurance scheme or any existing government scheme such as Medicare , which they regard as rationing by the back door. Republican amendments to the bill would not prevent the private insurance sectors from citing CER to restrict coverage and apply rationing of their funds, a situation which would create a competition imbalance between the public and private sector insurers. Health care reforms proposed during the Obama administration Healthcare reform was a major topic of discussion during the Democratic presidential primaries. As the race narrowed, attention focused on the plans presented by the two leading candidates, New York Senator Hillary Clinton and the eventual nominee, Illinois Senator Barack Obama. During the general election , Obama said that fixing healthcare would be one of his top four priorities if he won the presidency. After his inauguration, Obama announced to a joint session of Congress in February his intent to work with Congress to construct a plan for healthcare reform. The reform negotiations also attracted a great deal of attention from lobbyists , [ ] including deals among certain lobbies and the advocates of the law to win the support of groups who had opposed past reform efforts, such as in Over the recess, the Tea Party movement organized protests and many conservative groups and individuals targeted congressional town hall meetings to voice their opposition to the proposed reform bills. Instead, the Senate took up H. With the Republican minority in the Senate vowing to filibuster any bill that they did not support, requiring a cloture vote to end debate, 60 votes would be necessary to get passage in the Senate. Negotiations continued even after July 7<sup>th</sup> when Al Franken was sworn into office, and by which time Arlen Specter had switched parties<sup>th</sup> because of disagreements over the substance of the bill, which was still being drafted in committee, and because moderate Democrats hoped to win bipartisan support. However, on August 25, before the bill could come up for a vote, Ted Kennedy<sup>th</sup> a long-time advocate for healthcare reform<sup>th</sup> died, depriving Democrats of their 60th vote. Before the seat was filled, attention was drawn to Senator Snowe because of her vote in favor of the draft bill in the Finance Committee on October 15, however she explicitly stated that this did not mean she would support the final bill. Following the Finance Committee vote, negotiations turned to the demands of moderate Democrats to finalize their support, whose votes would be necessary to break the Republican filibuster. Lieberman, despite intense negotiations in search of a compromise by Reid, refused to support a public option ; a concession granted only after Lieberman agreed to commit to voting for the bill if the provision was not included, [99] [ ] even though it had majority support in Congress.

**Chapter 5 : War is the health of the state**

*"War is the health of the state," the radical writer Randolph Bourne said, in the midst of the First World War. Indeed, as the nations of Europe went to war in*

Randolph Bourne left an unfinished, unpaginated draft of *The State* when he died during the flu pandemic of 1918. The draft was published posthumously, with some material incorrectly ordered, in *Untimely Papers*. To most Americans of the classes which consider themselves significant the war brought a sense of the sanctity of the State which, if they had had time to think about it, would have seemed a sudden and surprising alteration in their habits of thought. In times of peace, we usually ignore the State in favour of partisan political controversies, or personal struggles for office, or the pursuit of party policies. It is the Government rather than the State with which the politically minded are concerned. The State is reduced to a shadowy emblem which comes to consciousness only on occasions of patriotic holiday. If your own party is in power, things may be assumed to be moving safely enough; but if the opposition is in, then clearly all safety and honor have fled the State. Yet you do not put it to yourself in quite that way. What you think is only that there are rascals to be turned out of a very practical machinery of offices and functions which you take for granted. When we say that Americans are lawless, we usually mean that they are less conscious than other peoples of the august majesty of the institution of the State as it stands behind the objective government of men and laws which we see. In a republic the men who hold office are indistinguishable from the mass. Very few of them possess the slightest personal dignity with which they could endow their political role; even if they ever thought of such a thing. And they have no class distinction to give them glamour. In a republic the Government is obeyed grumblingly, because it has no bedazzlements or sanctities to gild it. If you are a good old-fashioned democrat, you rejoice at this fact, you glory in the plainness of a system where every citizen has become a king. If you are more sophisticated you bemoan the passing of dignity and honor from affairs of State. But in practice, the democrat does not in the least treat his elected citizen with the respect due to a king, nor does the sophisticated citizen pay tribute to the dignity even when he finds it. What it has are of military origin, and in an unmilitary era such as we have passed through since the Civil War, even military trappings have been scarcely seen. In such an era the sense of the State almost fades out of the consciousness of men. The Government, with no mandate from the people, without consultation of the people, conducts all the negotiations, the backing and filling, the menaces and explanations, which slowly bring it into collision with some other Government, and gently and irresistibly slides the country into war. For the benefit of proud and haughty citizens, it is fortified with a list of the intolerable insults which have been hurled toward us by the other nations; for the benefit of the liberal and beneficent, it has a convincing set of moral purposes which our going to war will achieve; for the ambitious and aggressive classes, it can gently whisper of a bigger role in the destiny of the world. The result is that, even in those countries where the business of declaring war is theoretically in the hands of representatives of the people, no legislature has ever been known to decline the request of an Executive, which has conducted all foreign affairs in utter privacy and irresponsibility, that it order the nation into battle. Good democrats are wont to feel the crucial difference between a State in which the popular Parliament or Congress declares war, and the State in which an absolute monarch or ruling class declares war. But, put to the stern pragmatic test, the difference is not striking. In the freest of republics as well as in the most tyrannical of empires, all foreign policy, the diplomatic negotiations which produce or forestall war, are equally the private property of the Executive part of the Government, and are equally exposed to no check whatever from popular bodies, or the people voting as a mass themselves. The citizen throws off his contempt and indifference to Government, identifies himself with its purposes, revives all his military memories and symbols, and the State once more walks, an august presence, through the imaginations of men. Patriotism becomes the dominant feeling, and produces immediately that intense and hopeless confusion between the relations which the individual bears and should bear toward the society of which he is a part. In our quieter moments, the Nation or Country forms the basic idea of society. Our idea of Country concerns itself with the non-political aspects of a people, its ways of living, its personal traits, its literature and art, its characteristic attitudes toward life.

We are Americans because we live in a certain bounded territory, because our ancestors have carried on a great enterprise of pioneering and colonization, because we live in certain kinds of communities which have a certain look and express their aspirations in certain ways. We can see that our civilization is different from contiguous civilizations like the Indian and Mexican. The institutions of our country form a certain network which affects us vitally and intrigues our thoughts in a way that these other civilizations do not. We are a part of Country, for better or for worse. We have arrived in it through the operation of physiological laws, and not in any way through our own choice. By the time we have reached what are called years of discretion, its influences have molded our habits, our values, our ways of thinking, so that however aware we may become, we never really lose the stamp of our civilization, or could be mistaken for the child of any other country. Our feeling for our fellow countrymen is one of similarity or of mere acquaintance. We may be intensely proud of and congenial to our particular network of civilization, or we may detest most of its qualities and rage at its defects. This does not alter the fact that we are inextricably bound up in it. The Country, as an inescapable group into which we are born, and which makes us its particular kind of a citizen of the world, seems to be a fundamental fact of our consciousness, an irreducible minimum of social feeling. In our simple conception of country there is no more feeling of rivalry with other peoples than there is in our feeling for our family. Our interest turns within rather than without, is intensive and not belligerent. We grow up and our imaginations gradually stake out the world we live in, they need no greater conscious satisfaction for their gregarious impulses than this sense of a great mass of people to whom we are more or less attuned, and in whose institutions we are functioning. The feeling for country would be an uninflatable maximum were it not for the ideas of State and Government which are associated with it. Country is a concept of peace, of tolerance, of living and letting live. But State is essentially a concept of power, of competition: And we have the misfortune of being born not only into a country but into a State, and as we grow up we learn to mingle the two feelings into a hopeless confusion. International politics is a power politics because it is a relation of States and that is what States infallibly and calamitously are, huge aggregations of human and industrial force that may be hurled against each other in war. When a country acts as a whole in relation to another country, or in imposing laws on its own inhabitants, or in coercing or punishing individuals or minorities, it is acting as a State. The history of America as a country is quite different from that of America as a State. In one case it is the drama of the pioneering conquest of the land, of the growth of wealth and the ways in which it was used, of the enterprise of education, and the carrying out of spiritual ideals, of the struggle of economic classes. But as a State, its history is that of playing a part in the world, making war, obstructing international trade, preventing itself from being split to pieces, punishing those citizens whom society agrees are offensive, and collecting money to pay for all. It is the machinery by which the nation, organized as a State, carries out its State functions. Government is a framework of the administration of laws, and the carrying out of the public force. Government is the idea of the State put into practical operation in the hands of definite, concrete, fallible men. It is the visible sign of the invisible grace. It is the word made flesh. And it has necessarily the limitations inherent in all practicality. Government is the only form in which we can envisage the State, but it is by no means identical with it. That the State is a mystical conception is something that must never be forgotten. Its glamor and its significance linger behind the framework of Government and direct its activities. In times of peace the sense of the State flags in a republic that is not militarized. For war is essentially the health of the State. The ideal of the State is that within its territory its power and influence should be universal. As the Church is the medium for the spiritual salvation of man, so the State is thought of as the medium for his political salvation. Its idealism is a rich blood flowing to all the members of the body politic. And it is precisely in war that the urgency for union seems greatest, and the necessity for universality seems most unquestioned. The State is the organization of the herd to act offensively or defensively against another herd similarly organized. The more terrifying the occasion for defense, the closer will become the organization and the more coercive the influence upon each member of the herd. War sends the current of purpose and activity flowing down to the lowest levels of the herd, and to its remote branches. The slack is taken up, the cross-currents fade out, and the nation moves lumberingly and slowly, but with ever accelerated speed and integration, towards the great end, towards that of which L. Jacks has spoken so unforgettably. Individuals are

jolted out of their old routine, many of them are given new positions of responsibility, new techniques must be learnt. Wearing home times are broken and women who would have remained attached with infantile bonds are liberated for service overseas. A vast sense of rejuvenescence pervades the significant classes, a sense of new importance in the world. Old national ideals are taken out, re-adapted to the purpose and used as the universal touchstones, or molds into which all thought is poured. Every individual citizen who in peacetimes had no living fragment of the State becomes an active amateur agent of the Government in reporting spies and disloyalists, in raising Government funds, or in propagating such measures as are considered necessary by officialdom. Minority opinion, which in times of peace was only irritating and could not be dealt with by law unless it was conjoined with actual crime, becomes with the outbreak of war, a case for outlawry. Criticism of the State, objections to war, lukewarm opinions concerning the necessity or the beauty of conscription, are made subject to ferocious penalties, far exceeding [in] severity those affixed to actual pragmatic crimes. Public opinion, as expressed in the newspapers, and the pulpits and the schools, becomes one solid block. Loyalty, or rather war orthodoxy, becomes the sole test for all professions, techniques, occupations. Particularly is this true in the sphere of the intellectual life. There the smallest taint is held to spread over the whole soul, so that a professor of physics is ipso facto disqualified to teach physics or hold honorable place in a universityâ€”the republic of learningâ€”if he is at all unsound on the war. Even mere association with persons thus tainted is considered to disqualify a teacher. Anything pertaining to the enemy becomes taboo. His books are suppressed wherever possible, his language is forbidden. His artistic products are considered to convey in the subtlest spiritual way taints of vast poison to the soul that permits itself to enjoy them. So enemy music is suppressed, and energetic measures of opprobrium taken against those whose artistic consciences are not ready to perform such an act of self-sacrifice. The rage for loyal conformity works impartially, and often in diametric opposition to other orthodoxies and traditional conformities or ideals. The triumphant orthodoxy of the State is shown at its apex perhaps when Christian preachers lose their pulpits for taking in more or less literal terms the Sermon on the Mount, and Christian zealots are sent to prison for twenty years for distributing tracts which argue that war is unscriptural. It automatically sets in motion throughout society those irresistible forces for uniformity, for passionate cooperation with the Government in coercing into obedience the minority groups and individuals which lack the larger herd sense. The machinery of government sets and enforces the drastic penalties. The minorities are either intimidated into silence, or brought slowly around by subtle process of persuasion which may seem to them really to be converting them. Of course, the ideal of perfect loyalty, perfect uniformity is never really attained. The classes upon whom the amateur work of coercion falls are unwearied in their zeal, but often their agitation, instead of converting merely serves to stiffen their resistance. Minorities are rendered sullen, and some intellectual opinion bitter and satirical. But in general, the nation in wartime attains a uniformity of feeling, a hierarchy of values culminating at the undisputed apex of the State ideal, which could not possibly be produced through any other agency than war. Other values such as artistic creation, knowledge, reason, beauty, the enhancement of life, are instantly and almost unanimously sacrificed, and the significant classes who have constituted themselves the amateur agents of the State, are engaged not only in sacrificing these values for themselves but in coercing all other persons into sacrificing them. Citizens are no longer indifferent to their Government, but each cell of the body politic is brimming with life and activity. We are at last on the way to full realization of that collective community in which each individual somehow contains the virtue of the whole.

**Chapter 6 : War is the health of the state? | Yahoo Answers**

*War is the health of the State and it is during war that one best understands the nature of that institution. If the American democracy during wartime has acted with.*

War is the health of the state "War is the health of the state," the radical writer Randolph Bourne said, in the midst of the First World War. Indeed, as the nations of Europe went to war in , the governments flourished, patriotism bloomed, class struggle was stilled, and young men died in frightful numbers on the battlefields-often for a hundred yards of land, a line of trenches. In the United States, not yet in the war, there was worry about the health of the state. The IWW seemed to be everywhere. Class conflict was intense. In the summer of , during a Preparedness Day parade in San Francisco, a bomb exploded, killing nine people; two local radicals, Tom Mooney and Warren Billings, were arrested and would spend twenty years in prison. Shortly after that Senator James Wadsworth of New York suggested compulsory military training for all males to avert the danger that "these people of ours shall be divided into classes. Ten million were to die on the battlefield; 20 million were to die of hunger and disease related to the war. And no one since that day has been able to show that the war brought any gain for humanity that would be worth one human life. The rhetoric of the socialists, that it was an "imperialist war," now seems moderate and hardly arguable. The advanced capitalist countries of Europe were fighting over boundaries, colonies, spheres of influence; they were competing for Alsace-Lorraine, the Balkans, Africa, the Middle East. The war came shortly after the opening of the twentieth century, in the midst of exultation perhaps only among the elite in the Western world about progress and modernization. One day after the English declared war, Henry James wrote to a friend: Each side had , casualties. The killing started very fast, and on a large scale. In August , a volunteer for the British army had to be 5 feet 8 inches to enlist. By October, the requirement was lowered to 5 feet 5 inches. That month there were thirty thousand casualties, and then one could be 5 feet 3. In the first three months of war, almost the entire original British army was wiped out. For three years the battle lines remained virtually stationary in France. Each side would push forward, then back, then forward again- for a few yards, a few miles, while the corpses piled up. In the Germans tried to break through at Verdun; the British and French counterattacked along the Seine, moved forward a few miles, and lost , men. Twenty-four hours later, there were eighty-four left. Back home, the British were not told of the slaughter. One English writer recalled: The six German divisions opened up with their machine guns. On January 1, , Haig was promoted to field marshal. Despite the opposition of Lloyd George and the skepticism of some of his subordinates, Haig proceeded hopefully to the main offensive. The third battle of Ypres was a series of 8 heavy attacks, carried through in driving rain and fought over ground water-logged and muddy. No break-through was effected, and the total gain was about 5 miles of territory, which made the Ypres salient more inconvenient than ever and cost the British about , men. The people of France and Britain were not told the extent of the casualties. How the Civilian May Help in this Crisis. Write encouragingly to friends at the front Into this pit of death and deception came the United States, in the spring of Mutinies were beginning to occur in the French army. Soon, out of divisions, 68 would have mutinies; men would be tried and condemned, 50 shot by firing squads. American troops were badly needed. President Woodrow Wilson had promised that the United States would stay neutral in the war: Wilson now said he must stand by the right of Americans to travel on merchant ships in the war zone. Hofstadter says Wilson "was forced to find legal reasons for policies that were based not upon law but upon the balance of power and economic necessities. In early , the British liner Lusitania was torpedoed and sunk by a German submarine. She sank in eighteen minutes, and 1, people died, including Americans. The United States claimed the Lusitania carried an innocent cargo, and therefore the torpedoing was a monstrous German atrocity. Actually, the Lusitania was heavily armed: Her manifests were falsified to hide this fact, and the British and American governments lied about the cargo. In a serious recession had begun in the United States. Business throughout the country was depressed, farm prices were deflated, unemployment was serious, the heavy industries were working far below capacity and bank clearings were off. Morgan and Company acted as agents for the Allies, and when, in , Wilson lifted the ban on private bank loans to the Allies, Morgan could now

begin lending money in such great amounts as to both make great profit and tie American finance closely to the interest of a British victory in the war against Germany. True, the war meant more production, more employment, but did the workers in the steel plants gain as much as U. When the United States entered the war, it was the rich who took even more direct charge of the economy. Financier Bernard Baruch headed the War Industries Board, the most powerful of the wartime government agencies. Bankers, railroad men, and industrialists dominated these agencies. Du Bois saw more than that. He pointed to the paradox of greater "democracy" in America alongside "increased aristocracy and hatred toward darker races. American capitalism needed international rivalry-and periodic war-to create an artificial community of interest between rich and poor, supplanting the genuine community of interest among the poor that showed itself in sporadic movements. How conscious of this were individual entrepreneurs and statesmen? That is hard to know. But their actions, even if half-conscious, instinctive drives to survive, matched such a scheme. And in this demanded a national consensus for war. The government quickly succeeded in creating such a consensus, according to the traditional histories. The government had to work hard to create its consensus. That there was no spontaneous urge to fight is suggested by the strong measures taken: Despite the rousing words of Wilson about a war "to end all wars" and "to make the world safe for democracy," Americans did not rush to enlist. A million men were needed, but in the first six weeks after the declaration of war only 73, volunteered. Congress voted overwhelmingly for a draft. It sponsored 75, speakers, who gave , four-minute speeches in five thousand American cities and towns. It was a massive effort to excite a reluctant public. At the beginning of , a member of the National Civic Federation had complained that "neither workingmen nor farmers" were taking "any part or interest in the efforts of the security or defense leagues or other movements for national preparedness. Louis and called the declaration "a crime against the people of the United States. A local newspaper in Wisconsin, the Plymouth Review, said that probably no party ever gained more rapidly in strength than the Socialist party just at the present time. Their candidate for mayor of New York. Morris Hillquit, got 22 percent of the vote, five times the normal Socialist vote there. Ten Socialists were elected to the New York State legislature. In Chicago, the party vote went from 3. In Buffalo, it went from 2. George Creel and the government were behind the formation of an American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, whose president was Samuel Gompers and whose aim was to "unify sentiment in the nation" for the war. There were branches in cities; many labor leaders went along. According to James Weinstein, however, the Alliance did not work: Congress passed, and Wilson signed, in June of , the Espionage Act. From its title one would suppose it was an act against spying. However, it had a clause that provided penalties up to twenty years in prison for "Whoever, when the United States is at war, shall willfully cause or attempt to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or shall willfully obstruct the recruiting or enlistment service of the U. It even had a clause that said "nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or restrict. The Espionage Act was used to imprison Americans who spoke or wrote against the war. Two months after the law passed, a Socialist named Charles Schenck was arrested in Philadelphia for printing and distributing fifteen thousand leaflets that denounced the draft law and the war. The leaflet recited the Thirteenth Amendment provision against "involuntary servitude" and said the Conscription Act violated this. Conscription, it said, was "a monstrous deed against humanity in the interests of the financiers of Wall Street. Schenck appealed, arguing that the Act, by prosecuting speech and writing, violated the First Amendment: He summarized the contents of the leaflet and said it was undoubtedly intended to "obstruct" the carrying out of the draft law. Was Schenck protected by the First Amendment? The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting fire in a theatre and causing a panic. The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent. Few people would think free speech should be conferred on someone shouting fire in a theater and causing a panic. But did that example fit criticism of the war? Zechariah Chafee, a Harvard law school professor, wrote later Free Speech in the United States that a more apt analogy for Schenck was someone getting up between the acts at a theater and declaring that there were not enough fire exits. To play further with the example: Perhaps free speech could not be tolerated by any reasonable person if it constituted a "clear and present danger" to life and liberty;

after all, free speech must compete with other vital rights. But was not the war itself a "clear and present danger," indeed, more clear and more present and more dangerous to life than any argument against it? Did citizens not have a right to object to war, a right to be a danger to dangerous policies? The Espionage Act, thus approved by the Supreme Court, has remained on the books all these years since World War I, and although it is supposed to apply only in wartime, it has been constantly in force since , because the United States has legally been in a "state of emergency" since the Korean war.

**Chapter 7 : War is the Health of the State: Its Meaning**

*The State "War is the Health of the State" by Randolph Bourne (). To most Americans of the classes which consider themselves significant the war [World War I] brought a sense of the sanctity of the State which, if they had had time to think about it, would have seemed a sudden and surprising alteration in their habits of thought.*

In times of peace, we usually ignore the State in favour of partisan political controversies, or personal struggles for office, or the pursuit of party policies. It is the Government rather than the State with which the politically minded are concerned. The State is reduced to a shadowy emblem which comes to consciousness only on occasions of patriotic holiday. Government is obviously composed of common and unsanctified men, and is thus a legitimate object of criticism and even contempt. If your own party is in power, things may be assumed to be moving safely enough; but if the opposition is in, then clearly all safety and honor have fled the State. Yet you do not put it to yourself in quite that way. What you think is only that there are rascals to be turned out of a very practical machinery of offices and functions which you take for granted. When we say that Americans are lawless, we usually mean that they are less conscious than other peoples of the august majesty of the institution of the State as it stands behind the objective government of men and laws which we see. In a republic the men who hold office are indistinguishable from the mass. Very few of them possess the slightest personal dignity with which they could endow their political role; even if they ever thought of such a thing. And they have no class distinction to give them glamour. In a republic the Government is obeyed grumblingly, because it has no bedazzlements or sanctities to gild it. If you are a good old-fashioned democrat, you rejoice at this fact, you glory in the plainness of a system where every citizen has become a king. If you are more sophisticated you bemoan the passing of dignity and honor from affairs of State. But in practice, the democrat does not in the least treat his elected citizen with the respect due to a king, nor does the sophisticated citizen pay tribute to the dignity even when he finds it. What it has are of military origin, and in an unmilitary era such as we have passed through since the Civil War, even military trappings have been scarcely seen. In such an era the sense of the State almost fades out of the consciousness of men. With the shock of war, however, the State comes into its own again. The Government, with no mandate from the people, without consultation of the people, conducts all the negotiations, the backing and filling, the menaces and explanations, which slowly bring it into collision with some other Government, and gently and irresistibly slides the country into war. For the benefit of proud and haughty citizens, it is fortified with a list of the intolerable insults which have been hurled toward us by the other nations; for the benefit of the liberal and beneficent, it has a convincing set of moral purposes which our going to war will achieve; for the ambitious and aggressive classes, it can gently whisper of a bigger role in the destiny of the world. The result is that, even in those countries where the business of declaring war is theoretically in the hands of representatives of the people, no legislature has ever been known to decline the request of an Executive, which has conducted all foreign affairs in utter privacy and irresponsibility, that it order the nation into battle. Good democrats are wont to feel the crucial difference between a State in which the popular Parliament or Congress declares war, and the State in which an absolute monarch or ruling class declares war. But, put to the stern pragmatic test, the difference is not striking. In the freest of republics as well as in the most tyrannical of empires, all foreign policy, the diplomatic negotiations which produce or forestall war, are equally the private property of the Executive part of the Government, and are equally exposed to no check whatever from popular bodies, or the people voting as a mass themselves. The moment war is declared, however, the mass of the people, through some spiritual alchemy, become convinced that they have willed and executed the deed themselves. The citizen throws off his contempt and indifference to Government, identifies himself with its purposes, revives all his military memories and symbols, and the State once more walks, an august presence, through the imaginations of men. Patriotism becomes the dominant feeling, and produces immediately that intense and hopeless confusion between the relations which the individual bears and should bear toward the society of which he is a part. The patriot loses all sense of the distinction between State, nation, and government. In our quieter moments, the Nation or Country forms the basic idea of society. Our idea of Country concerns itself

with the non-political aspects of a people, its ways of living, its personal traits, its literature and art, its characteristic attitudes toward life. We are Americans because we live in a certain bounded territory, because our ancestors have carried on a great enterprise of pioneering and colonization, because we live in certain kinds of communities which have a certain look and express their aspirations in certain ways. We can see that our civilization is different from contiguous civilizations like the Indian and Mexican. The institutions of our country form a certain network which affects us vitally and intrigues our thoughts in a way that these other civilizations do not. We are a part of Country, for better or for worse. We have arrived in it through the operation of physiological laws, and not in any way through our own choice. By the time we have reached what are called years of discretion, its influences have molded our habits, our values, our ways of thinking, so that however aware we may become, we never really lose the stamp of our civilization, or could be mistaken for the child of any other country. Our feeling for our fellow countrymen is one of similarity or of mere acquaintance. We may be intensely proud of and congenial to our particular network of civilization, or we may detest most of its qualities and rage at its defects. This does not alter the fact that we are inextricably bound up in it. The Country, as an inescapable group into which we are born, and which makes us its particular kind of a citizen of the world, seems to be a fundamental fact of our consciousness, an irreducible minimum of social feeling. In our simple conception of country there is no more feeling of rivalry with other peoples than there is in our feeling for our family. Our interest turns within rather than without, is intensive and not belligerent. We grow up and our imaginations gradually stake out the world we live in, they need no greater conscious satisfaction for their gregarious impulses than this sense of a great mass of people to whom we are more or less attuned, and in whose institutions we are functioning. The feeling for country would be an uninflatable maximum were it not for the ideas of State and Government which are associated with it. Country is a concept of peace, of tolerance, of living and letting live. But State is essentially a concept of power, of competition: And we have the misfortune of being born not only into a country but into a State, and as we grow up we learn to mingle the two feelings into a hopeless confusion. The State is the country acting as a political unit, it is the group acting as a repository of force, determiner of law, arbiter of justice. International politics is a "power politics" because it is a relation of States and that is what States infallibly and calamitously are, huge aggregations of human and industrial force that may be hurled against each other in war. When a country acts as a whole in relation to another country, or in imposing laws on its own inhabitants, or in coercing or punishing individuals or minorities, it is acting as a State. The history of America as a country is quite different from that of America as a State. In one case it is the drama of the pioneering conquest of the land, of the growth of wealth and the ways in which it was used, of the enterprise of education, and the carrying out of spiritual ideals, of the struggle of economic classes. But as a State, its history is that of playing a part in the world, making war, obstructing international trade, preventing itself from being split to pieces, punishing those citizens whom society agrees are offensive, and collecting money to pay for all. Government on the other hand is synonymous with neither State nor Nation. It is the machinery by which the nation, organized as a State, carries out its State functions. Government is a framework of the administration of laws, and the carrying out of the public force. Government is the idea of the State put into practical operation in the hands of definite, concrete, fallible men. It is the visible sign of the invisible grace. It is the word made flesh. And it has necessarily the limitations inherent in all practicality. Government is the only form in which we can envisage the State, but it is by no means identical with it. That the State is a mystical conception is something that must never be forgotten. Its glamour and its significance linger behind the framework of Government and direct its activities. Wartime brings the ideal of the State out into very clear relief, and reveals attitudes and tendencies that were hidden. In times of peace the sense of the State flags in a republic that is not militarized. For war is essentially the health of the State. The ideal of the State is that within its territory its power and influence should be universal. As the Church is the medium for the spiritual salvation of man, so the State is thought of as the medium for his political salvation. Its idealism is a rich blood flowing to all the members of the body politic. And it is precisely in war that the urgency for union seems greatest, and the necessity for universality seems most unquestioned. The State is the organization of the herd to act offensively or defensively against another herd similarly organized. The more terrifying the occasion for defense, the closer will become the

organization and the more coercive the influence upon each member of the herd. War sends the current of purpose and activity flowing down to the lowest level of the herd, and to its most remote branches. The slack is taken up, the cross-currents fade out, and the nation moves lumberingly and slowly, but with ever accelerated speed and integration, toward the great end, toward the "peacefulness of being at war," of which L. Jacks has so unforgettably spoken. The classes which are able to play an active and not merely a passive role in the organization for war get a tremendous liberation of activity and energy. Individuals are jolted out of their old routine, many of them are given new positions of responsibility, new techniques must be learned. Wearing home ties are broken and women who would have remained attached with infantile bonds are liberated for service overseas. A vast sense of rejuvenescence pervades the significant classes, a sense of new importance in the world. Old national ideals are taken out, re-adapted to the purpose and used as universal touchstones, or molds into which all thought is poured. Every individual citizen who in peacetimes had no function to perform by which he could imagine himself an expression or living fragment of the State becomes an active amateur agent of the Government in reporting spies and disloyalists, in raising Government funds, or in propagating such measures as are considered necessary by officialdom. Minority opinion, which in times of peace, was only irritating and could not be dealt with by law unless it was conjoined with actual crime, becomes, with the outbreak of war, a case for outlawry. Criticism of the State, objections to war, lukewarm opinions concerning the necessity or the beauty of conscription, are made subject to ferocious penalties, far exceeding in severity those affixed to actual pragmatic crimes. Public opinion, as expressed in the newspapers, and the pulpits and the schools, becomes one solid block. Particularly is this true in the sphere of the intellectual life. There the smallest taint is held to spread over the whole soul, so that a professor of physics is ipso facto disqualified to teach physics or to hold honorable place in a university - the republic of learning - if he is at all unsound on the war. Even mere association with persons thus tainted is considered to disqualify a teacher. Anything pertaining to the enemy becomes taboo. His books are suppressed wherever possible, his language is forbidden. His artistic products are considered to convey in the subtlest spiritual way taints of vast poison to the soul that permits itself to enjoy them. So enemy music is suppressed, and energetic measures of opprobrium taken against those whose artistic consciences are not ready to perform such an act of self-sacrifice. The rage for loyal conformity works impartially, and often in diametric opposition to other orthodoxies and traditional conformities, or even ideals. The triumphant orthodoxy of the State is shown at its apex perhaps when Christian preachers lose their pulpits for taking in more or less literal terms the Sermon on the Mount, and Christian zealots are sent to prison for twenty years for distributing tracts which argue that war is unscriptural. War is the health of the State. It automatically sets in motion throughout society those irresistible forces for uniformity, for passionate cooperation with the Government in coercing into obedience the minority groups and individuals which lack the larger herd sense. The machinery of government sets and enforces the drastic penalties; the minorities are either intimidated into silence, or brought slowly around by a subtle process of persuasion which may seem to them really to be converting them. Of course, the ideal of perfect loyalty, perfect uniformity is never really attained. The classes upon whom the amateur work of coercion falls are unwearied in their zeal, but often their agitation instead of converting, merely serves to stiffen their resistance. Minorities are rendered sullen, and some intellectual opinion bitter and satirical.

**Chapter 8 : War, The Health Of The State**

*At the height of World War One, the radical writer Randolph Bourne wrote, "War is the health of the state." Throughout the war, while millions died and entire cities were destroyed, the governments of the Western world "flourished," and "class struggle was stilled."*

To grasp this complexity, it is necessary to explore the theoretical contexts within which the saying originated. The State, Government, and Society Bourne argues that, in times of peace, the majority of people do not give much thought to the State, but deal instead with the Government, which may be viewed as the practical day-to-day "offices and functions" of a State. Bourne defined Government as "a framework of the administration of laws, and the carrying out of the public force. Government is the idea of the State put into practical operation in the hands of definite, concrete, fallible men. The people whose jobs make Government function, such as postal workers and grade school teachers, have no sense of sanctity about them. They are what Bourne describes as "common and unsanctified men. Thus, in times of peace, "the sense of the State almost fades out of the consciousness of men. The American State is more of a concept than a physical reality. It is the political structure established by the American Revolution, which is embodied by the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Governments come and go but the State remains essentially the same. It is the State, not Government, that inspires emotions such as awe or patriotism within its citizenry because the State is considered to be sanctified by history and by the popular will. It is to the concept of the American State -- not to any particular Government, Republican or Democratic -- that people pledge allegiance with hands placed over their hearts. These non-political factors are what make the American society different from a Chinese or French society. For example, most people define themselves more in relation to a community, religion, or ethnic heritage than in relation to a political party. Unlike Government, society is not expression of the State, nor can it peacefully co-exist with the State because the two concepts are antagonistic. In an essay entitled "The State," Bourne observes, "Country [society] is a concept of peace, tolerance, of living and letting live. But State is essentially a concept of power, of competition; it signifies a group in its aggressive aspects. And we have the misfortune of being born not only into a country but into a State, and as we grow up we learn to mingle the two feelings into a hopeless confusion. Yet the lines separating these three concepts, or institutions, are not clearly drawn. The Impact of War Bourne defines war as the ultimate act of Statehood, of "a group in its aggressive aspects," which could not exist with the State. Bourne argues that war so blurs the lines separate the State from Government and from society that the lines virtually disappear in the minds of most people. Filled with emotion, the patriot loses "all sense of the distinction between State, nation and government. For example, although criticizing the President is a right regularly exercised by almost every American, such criticism becomes an act of treason when that President has just declared war. As Bourne explains, " In times of war, the hierarchy and the power of these concepts is inverted. The Government virtually becomes the State, and society is subordinated to both. The Individual in War Time What happens to the individual in the process of society and Government being dominated by the State? In times of peace, an individual acts according to his own conscience to secure what he believes to be in his self-interest, which usually includes pursuing prosperity, security for the family, and spending time on unique interests e. Individuals interact peacefully in society without any necessary co-ordination because the interactions are sparked by a common desire such as attending a football game, or exchanging goods for money without any loss of individual choice. In times of war, individuals become what Bourne refers to as "the herd. Nevertheless, "by an ingenious mixture of cajolery, agitation, intimidation, the herd is licked into shape, into an effective mechanical unity, if not into a spiritual whole. The State attempts to draw upon the powerful force of individual choice by appealing to the patriotism of people and asking them to make the "choice" to enlist and otherwise support the war effort. Usually, the individual obliges because "[in] a nation at war, every citizen identifies himself with the whole, and feels immensely strengthened in that identification. Bourne likens this mysticism to the response often offered to religion. Feeling strengthened by "identifying with the whole," people cease to be individuals and become, instead, citizens of the State. The man who dissents and remains an individual feels

"forlorn and helpless," while those who think and feel as the others in the herd have "the warm feeling of obedience, the soothing irresponsibility of protection. He provides very little in the way of critiquing specific policies. In essence, Bourne addressed the moral consequences of war upon a post-war society which had abandoned individualism in favor of "the herd-machinery. By this observation, Bourne did not mean that peace time America would struggle under the increased bureaucracy that never seems to roll-back to pre-war levels. Many historians have made this point. Bourne addressed the less tangible, though arguably more significant, costs of war. For example, post America would be burdened by intellectuals who had "forgotten that the real enemy is War rather than imperial Germany.

**Chapter 9 : A Brief History: Universal Health Care Efforts in the US - PNHP**

*War is the Health of the State Posted on January 4, by Kyle Rearden War hysteria is an excellent mechanism used by the Establishment to artificially manufacture popular consent for whatever nefarious agenda the government wants to coercively impose on the population this week.*

Socialism was an ongoing threat to the power elite. Zinn cites James Wadsworth as proof that the American government deliberately tried to distract and weaken the American people. Furthermore, he praises the Socialist movement for denouncing the war for what, in retrospect, it clearly was: Active Themes European governments convinced their people to fight in the war, in part by celebrating patriotism, but also by lying about the number of casualties in the war. Morgan loaned huge sums of money to England, knowing that he stood to make a huge profit if England prospered. Bankers and capitalists had invested large amounts of their own money in the English economy, and they had every reason to want England to win the war. Therefore, Zinn implies, they pressured Wilson to start a war. Du Bois wrote a prophetic article arguing that the war was motivated by a desire to control the immense natural wealth of Africa. Du Bois went on to argue that war was a necessary part of modern capitalist society: The Socialist party held a meeting in St. Louis, where it called the war an injustice. Later in , Socialists held anti-war protests, some with as many as twenty thousand people. Later in the year, Socialist politicians did surprisingly well in elections: Active Themes In response to the opposition to the war, Congress passed the Espionage Act, which introduced a twenty-year sentence for anyone inciting insubordination or interfering with the war effort. The Espionage Act was designed to gag anyone criticizing the war. Eugene Debs was imprisoned for criticizing the war, and he spent more than two years in jail. Active Themes During World War One, the American government tightened its control over its own people, not only by limiting free speech but also by prosecuting draft dodgers. In , the government arrested more than one hundred I. In the end, Haywood was sentenced to twenty years in prison, and I. Haywood fled to Soviet Russia, where he lived for the rest of his life. Active Themes In , the war ended, and a mood of disillusion spread across America. The American government continued to fear socialism. In , the government prosecuted or deported thousands of immigrants suspected of socialist or anarchist ties. Two of the most famous such immigrants were Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti. Sacco and Vanzetti were prosecuted for murderâ€”the legal record strongly suggests that they were found guilty and executed largely because they were foreigners and anarchists. Intellectuals, philosophers, and writers voiced their opposition to the war in various ways: Many scholars have argued that Sacco and Vanzetti were unjustly convicted of a crime. Active Themes The elite in the U. During World War One, they used a mixture of patriotism and prosecution to send a message to the working classes: As with his treatment of the Mexican American War and the Spanish American War, Zinn focuses on the popular resistance to World War One, implying that the large numbers of people who did, in fact, support the war had only been fooled into supporting it by government propaganda. War is the Health of the State. Retrieved November 13,